

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
June 18, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on June 18, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cumulative Impact Definitions
Attachment 4	April 2002 Update
Attachment 5	May 2002 Update

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – March 19, 2002 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the March 19, 2002 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C40: Research Information on possible Proposition 40 funding for activities at Oroville.
Status: Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager is still exploring how Proposition 40 funds might affect Oroville activities. Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors noted continuing efforts to pursue possible Proposition 40 funds by other local parties, but that he was not aware of any formal decisions or submitted grant applications.

Action Item #C41: Distribute Work Group summaries for April and May 2002.
Status: Janis Offermann reported that summaries for April and May activities were distributed via mail to Work Group participants. Additional copies were available at the June 18, 2002 meeting and are included as Attachments 4 and 5 to this summary.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Mark Selverston with the consulting team reported that the field teams are in week seven of Study Plan C1 implementation and progressing smoothly. He added that they were putting the final touches on the research design and that the historical research was continuing. They are also assembling the names of individuals to be interviewed by the oral historians. He explained that the field teams began by revisiting known sites that had been recorded in the past. He approximated that there are 213 known historic and prehistoric sites in the study area that are above the minimum pool elevation. Mark explained that the field team would be examining approximately 30% of the Project area above the fluctuation zone. The team estimates that 30% of that area comprises approximately 6000 acres and of that area, the field teams have surveyed about 2000 acres. Within the area surveyed, 51 previously unknown sites (48 historic, 3 prehistoric) have been recorded.

The Facilitator asked what criteria the team uses to identify the 30% of land to be surveyed. Michael Delacorte with the consulting team explained that there are 5 components to the fieldwork: 1) examine 100% of the fluctuation zone; 2) re-record known sites; 3) examine specific parcels identified for new development during the relicensing process; 4) examine areas of historic interest; and 5) examine 30% of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) outside of the fluctuation zone. The 30% was identified by first converting existing vegetation maps to a Geographic Information System (GIS) database and then grouping the vegetation into 3 identifiable communities (oak woodland, sierra conifer, and disturbed valley). Michael explained to the participants that vegetation patterns provide the best clues to prehistoric and historic land use. The team will use the vegetation maps developed to examine lands within each grouping, so that the survey adequately examines portions of each of the key natural communities. He added that although the majority of newly recorded sites at this time are historic in nature, the number of prehistoric sites will likely increase once the survey of the fluctuation zone is completed.

Helen McCarthy of the consulting team reviewed the ethnographic progress for the participants. She reported that there are 3 ethnographic trainees ready to begin assisting in the interviews. She explained that the ethnographic team is currently reviewing archival sources, and are working mostly out of the Myers Street office. She announced that they will be coordinating with the archaeologists and developing a historic context that helps explain area use. She also explained they are developing a list of individuals for oral history interviews.

Several parties noted the active and positive participation of local Native Americans in the archaeological field efforts, as well as in the background research efforts associated with the ethnographic studies.

Leslie Steidl with Department of Parks and Recreation asked if there is a new map showing the APE. Janis Offermann responded that they haven't finalized an APE but are currently defining the APE as the FERC Project Boundary. Leslie also asked if there was any new information on land status within the FERC Boundary. Steve Heipel of the consulting team responded that he was not aware of any new information. Leslie Steidl inquired as to whether a work plan was available for review. Mark Selverston responded that there is an early draft of the detailed work plan available for review at the field office. Janis Offermann clarified that this was not a document intended for review or comment by the CRWG, but that it had been developed in close coordination with the Maidu Advisory Council.

Art Angle asked if the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land transfer currently being discussed within the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group was a FERC issue. The Facilitator responded that land transfers happen fairly frequently and that while FERC prefers a licensee to have control of the lands within a Project Boundary, they usually do not become actively involved in land transfers.

Leslie Steidl asked for more detail concerning the twenty historic features mentioned in the May 2002 update. Mark Selverston responded that they were all sites rather than features. Leslie asked if any artifacts have been collected. Michael Delacorte responded that a very limited number of prehistoric artifacts have been collected. No historic materials have been collected.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Art Angle provided an update on the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC). He announced that because of scheduling difficulties, the May MAC meeting was cancelled but they plan to meet soon, perhaps before the end of June.

Cumulative and ESA Impacts Discussion

Steve Heipel with the consulting team distributed a document containing two definitions of Cumulative Impacts, one oriented to analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act, and one based on the guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act. These definitions are provided as Attachment 3 to this summary. He explained that several months ago the Environmental Work Group initiated a Task Force to prepare a guidance document designed to assist study plan authors in developing study plans to deal with both Oroville Facilities cumulative impacts and Endangered Species Act effects. Steve reported that the Environmental Task Force released a draft guidance document that should be helpful as all of the Work Groups consider cumulative effects related to their resource areas. He then provided a brief introduction to the concepts of cumulative impacts. He explained that cumulative impacts are impacts that when considered alone may not be significant but when taken into consideration with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable activities within the project region may add up to a significant impact. He used the example of a retail development that alone may not impact an area significantly until one considers all of the other retail developments proposed for the area. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed that this topic should be discussed further during their next meeting.

One participant asked if anyone was looking at the noise level. The Facilitator responded that noise is typically examined in conjunction with the aesthetics studies.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

Janis Offermann proposed that for the next two months while the fieldwork continues, the scheduled Cultural Resources Work Group meetings be replaced with written summary updates. The updates will be mailed to the Cultural Resources Work Group participants. She proposed the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting be held on September 17, 2002 Steve Heipel requested that the August meeting be held in reserved to discuss cumulative impacts analysis if necessary. DWR would notify the participants if we decided to schedule the meeting otherwise the next meeting date would be September 17, 2002. The group concurred. The next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting will be:

Date: September 17, 2002
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #C42: Distribute Work Group summary updates for July and August 2002.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: July 30, 2002; August 30, 2002